

RICHARD MAC BRIDE, SB# 199695
LAW OFFICES OF RICHARD A. MAC BRIDE
855 Marina Bay Parkway, Suite 210
RICHMOND, CA 94804
Phone 415-730-6289
Fax 510-439-2786
Attorney for Plaintiff Richard Sepulveda

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

) Case Number _____
Richard Sepulveda,
)
)
)
Plaintiff,
)
)
) CIVIL RIGHTS
Vs.
)
) COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
Foothill Blvd. LLC, individually and dba
) AND DAMAGES: DENIAL OF CIVIL
Subway; and Does 1 to 50,
) RIGHTS OF A DISABLED PERSON, IN
) VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH
) DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 AS
Defendants.) AMENDED, AND VIOLATION OF
) CALIFORNIA'S CIVIL RIGHTS
) STATUTES
)
) JURY TRIAL REQUESTED

Plaintiff herein complains of defendants herein, and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This court has jurisdiction over this matter and these defendants pursuant to 28 USC § 1331 for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 USC §12101 et seq.). Pursuant to pendant jurisdiction, attendant and related causes of action, arising from the same facts, action is also brought under California law, including, but not limited to, violations of California Government Code §4450; California Health and Safety Code §19953 et seq., and applicable regulations, including but not limited to California Code of Regulations, Title 24, §19959; and California Civil Code §§ 51, 51.5, 52(a), 52.1, 54, 54.1, and 54.3. During the

1 periods relevant to this complaint, defendant Foothill Blvd. LLC, own and operate the business
 2 using the name “Subway” at 4415 Foothill Blvd., Oakland, California in this judicial district.
 3 On information and belief, during the periods relevant to this complaint, defendant Foothill
 4 Blvd. LLC, owned and own the real property on which this business is operated in this judicial
 5 district.

6 2. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 USC §1391(b) and is founded on the fact that the
 7 real property that is the subject of this action is located in this district, and that plaintiff's cause
 8 of action arose in this district.

9
 10 INTRODUCTION

11 3. Subway (the “Business”) is located at 4415 Foothill Blvd., Oakland, California. During the
 12 relevant periods in this lawsuit, said business was and is owned and operated by defendant
 13 Foothill Blvd. LLC. On information and belief, during the relevant periods in this lawsuit, the
 14 real property was and is owned by defendant Foothill Blvd. LLC. The Business is a “public
 15 accommodation and business establishment” subject to California Health and Safety Code
 16 §19955 et seq. and California Civil Code §54. On information and belief, this Business has,
 17 since July 1, 1970, undergone construction and/or “alterations, structural repairs, or additions,”
 18 subjecting such facility to disabled access requirements per Health and Safety Code §19955 to
 19 19959 et seq. Construction and alterations since July 1, 1982 also subjected these facilities to
 20 the requirements of California’s Title 24, the State Building Code. Further, irrespective of
 21 alteration history, such premises are subject to the “readily achievable” barrier removal
 22 requirements of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

23 4. Defendant Foothill Blvd. LLC operated and operate the Business, an establishment for
 24 services to the public at which business and location said defendants failed to provide barrier-
 25 free access to said establishment as required under federal and California state law. Further,
 26 defendants failed to provide compliance with the law as follows:

27 a. Exterior: The designated parking space was defective, as follows. These conditions
 28 violated the Americans With Disabilities Act (“ADA”), United States Access Board
 ADA Accessibility Guidelines (“ADAAG”). ADAAG §4.3.2 (1991 standards) and
 208.3 (2010 standards)(not on an accessible route); §4.6.3 (1991 standards) and 502.4

(2010 standards) (improper parking space dimensions, and parking space and access aisle sloped more than 2%); 4.6.4 (1991 standards) and 502.6 (2010 standards)(missing signage and lacking “van accessible”); and §4.6.6 and §4.1.2(5)(b) (1991 standards) and §502.3 (2010 standards) (the lack of proper passenger access aisle that is 96 inches wide and a parking space that is 18 feet long). The paint was faded to the point of not providing a clearly delineated space and access aisle. These conditions were also in violation of California Building Code (CBC) §11B-208 (there was faded and incomplete paint to delineate the space itself and the access aisle, and wrong color), 11B-705.1.2.5 (lack of detectable warnings at hazardous vehicle areas), 11B-502.2 (improper vehicle space dimensions), 11B-502.6.4 (faded and incomplete surface identification), 11B-502.6 (“\$250 fine” sign missing; required signage was missing or incomplete, and not properly located, and not “van accessible”); and 11B-502.3.3 (“no parking” not existent in an access aisle). 11B-503.4 (slope of access aisle more than 2%). This caused plaintiff difficulties in finding a safe place to park, safely exit his vehicle, and reach the entrance safely due to cross traffic through the transit area. This made it difficult to find and use a safe parking space. This caused plaintiff legitimate concern for his own safety as he got out of his vehicle and entered the facility. Also, because of the lack of a proper access aisles, plaintiff was concerned that another vehicle could pull in and try to park next to him without realizing that a disabled person was in the process of entering or exiting his vehicle. There were also policies and procedures in place that allowed non-disabled persons to regularly park in the designated space and the access aisle, thus blocking access for disabled persons.

5. The above barriers interfered with Plaintiff's access to the facilities at the Business, and continue to deter plaintiff from visiting said facilities, and as a legal result, plaintiff has suffered and suffers violations of his civil rights to full and equal enjoyment of goods, services, facilities and privileges, and has suffered and will suffer embarrassment and humiliation.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

1 6. Plaintiff is, and at all times relevant to this complaint is, a “physically handicapped person,” a
2 “physically disabled person,” and a “person with a disability” as those terms are used under
3 applicable California law and under applicable federal law, including, but not limited to, Title
4 III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. (The terms “physically handicapped
5 person,” a “physically disabled person,” and a “person with a disability” will be used
6 interchangeably throughout this complaint.) Plaintiff is limited in the use of his legs and must
7 use a walker.

8 7. Defendants Foothill Blvd. LLC, at all times relevant herein, were and are the owner, operator,
9 lessor, and/or lessee, franchisor and/or franchisee, of public facilities at the Business, known
10 and operated as “Subway,” located at 4415 Foothill Blvd., Oakland, California, subject to
11 California state law requiring full and equal access to public facilities pursuant to California
12 Health and Safety Code §19955 et seq., California Civil Code §§ 51, 51.5, 52(a), 52.1, 54,
13 54.1, and 54.3, and subject to Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and to
14 all the other legal requirements referred to in this complaint. Plaintiff does not know the
15 relative responsibilities of the defendants in the operation of the Business facilities complained
16 of herein, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such defendants.

17 8. Defendant Foothill Blvd. LLC, at all times relevant herein were and are the owner, operator,
18 possessor, builder and keeper of the Business called Subway in the city of Oakland, California.
19 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the defendants herein is the agent, employee, or
20 representative of each of the other defendants, and performed acts and omissions as stated
21 herein within the scope of such agency or employment or representative capacity and is
22 responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions of the other defendants in legally
23 causing the damages complained of herein, and have approved or ratified each of the acts or
24 omissions of each other defendant, as herein described.

25 9. Plaintiff does not know the true names and capacities of defendants Does 1 to 50, their
26 business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and the business, nor their
27 relative responsibilities or relationships among one another in causing the access violations
28 herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise among all
 defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the defendants herein is the agent,
 ostensible agent, master, servant, employer, employee, representative, franchiser, franchisee,
 joint venturer, partner, and associate, or such similar capacity, of each of the other defendants,

1 and was at all times acting and performing, or failing to act or perform, with the authorization,
2 consent, permission or ratification of each of the other defendants, and is responsible in some
3 manner for the acts and omissions of the other defendants in legally causing the violations and
4 damages complained of herein, and have approved or ratified each of the acts or omissions of
5 each other defendant, as herein described. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint
6 when the true names, capacities, connections and responsibilities of defendants are
ascertained.

7 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes that all named defendants, conspired to commit the acts
8 described herein, or alternatively aided and abetted one another in the performance of the
9 wrongful acts hereinafter complained of.

10 11. Defendants are the owners of the property and operators of the Business called Subway
11 located in the city of Oakland, California. This business, including, but not limited to, access
12 aisles and access routes, is or forms a part of a “public accommodation or facility” subject to
13 the requirements of *California Health & Safety Code* §19955, et seq., and of *California Civil*
14 *Code* §§51, 52(a), 54, 54.1, et seq. On information and belief, this business, or portions of it,
15 was constructed or altered after 1990, and after January 26, 1993, which fact has subjected the
16 business to handicapped access requirements per California Code of Regulations Title 24 (the
17 State Building Code).

18 12. On December 6, 2021, January 10, 2022, and February 25, 2022 (the “Visit Dates”), Plaintiff
19 visited the Business for the purpose of buying food and drink. Defendants interfered with
20 Plaintiff’s access to the Business as set forth herein. Plaintiff was further deterred from visiting
21 on March 23, 2022 due to the ongoing existence of the barriers, and claims statutory damages
for this deterred visit.

22 13. Said acts and omissions denied Plaintiff legal handicapped access to the Business and its
23 facilities as required under state and federal law.

24 14. Plaintiff’s home in Oakland, California is approximately four miles from the Business located
25 in the city of Oakland. Plaintiff travels regularly to and through said city on business and
26 pleasure trips. Plaintiff plans to return to the Business when this public accommodation is
made accessible. The Business is on a main thoroughfare.

27 15. Plaintiff himself encountered the architectural barriers described herein, and/or is informed
28 and believes that the architectural barriers described herein violate the California Code of

1 Regulations and the Americans with Disabilities Act Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities
 2 ("ADAAG") issued by the Department of Justice, and that they existed and continue to exist,
 3 and thereby deny Plaintiff and others similarly situated full and equal access to the Business
 4 facilities as set forth herein.

5 16. Defendants, and each of them, by these barriers, discriminated against Plaintiff, on the basis of
 6 his physical disability, and interfered with his access to the Business and its facilities, in
 7 violation of California law, including but not limited to §§51, 51.5, 54, 54.1, and in violation
 8 of Title III, §302, the "Prohibition against Discrimination" provision, and §503, the
 9 "Prohibition against Retaliation and Coercion" provision of the Americans with Disabilities
 10 Act of 1990.

11 17. As a result of the actions and failure to act of defendants, and each of them, and as a result of
 12 the failure to provide proper and accessible entryways, and accessible accommodations for a
 13 business such as this, Plaintiff suffered and will suffer the loss of his civil rights to full and
 14 equal access to public facilities, and further has suffered in the past and will suffer in the future
 15 emotional distress, mental distress, mental suffering, mental anguish, which includes shame,
 16 humiliation, embarrassment, anger, chagrin, disappointment and worry, expectedly and
 17 naturally associated with a person with a disability being denied access to a public
 18 accommodation, all to his damages as prayed hereinafter in an amount within the jurisdiction
 19 of this court.

20 I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH
 21 DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (42 USC 12101 et seq.)

22 18. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the
 23 allegations contained in paragraphs 1 to 17 above and incorporates them herein as if separately
 24 pled.

25 19. Pursuant to law, in 1990 the United States congress made findings per 42 USC 12101
 26 regarding persons with physical disabilities, finding that laws were needed to more fully
 27 protect [at that time] 43 million Americans with one or more physical or mental disabilities;
 28 [that] historically society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities;
 29 [that] such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious

1 and pervasive social problem; [that] the nation's proper goals regarding individuals with
2 disabilities are to assure equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living and
3 economic self-sufficiency such individuals; [and that] the continuing existence of unfair and
4 unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to
5 compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is
6 justifiably famous.

7 20. Congress stated as its purpose in passing the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42
8 USC 12102):

9 a. It is the purpose of this act (1) to provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate
10 for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities; (2) to provide
11 clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards; (3) to ensure that the Federal
12 Government plays a central role in enforcing the standards established in this Act on
13 behalf of individuals with disabilities; (4) to invoke the sweep of Congressional
14 authority, including the power to enforce the 14th amendment and to regulate
15 commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day to day by
16 people with disabilities.

17 21. As part of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Congress approved Title III – Public
18 Accommodations and Services Operated by Private Entities (42 USC 12181, et seq.) Among
19 the public accommodations identified under this title were “... a bakery, grocery store,
20 clothing store, hardware store, shopping center, or other sales or rental establishment.”

21 22. Pursuant to 42 USC 12182,

22 a. “No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and
23 equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or
24 accommodations by any person who owns, leases, (or leases to), or operates a place of
25 public accommodation.”

26 23. Among the general prohibitions against discrimination were included in 42 USC
27 12182(b)(1)(A)(i):

28 a. Denial of Participation. It shall be discriminatory to subject an individual on the basis
29 of a disability or disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through
30 contractual, licensing, or other arrangements, to a denial of the opportunity of the

1 individual or class to participate in or benefit from the goods, services, facilities,
2 privileges, advantages, or accommodations of an entity.

3 24. Among the general prohibitions against discrimination were included in 42 USC
4 12182(b)(1)(E):

5 a. Association. It shall be discriminatory to exclude or otherwise deny equal goods,
6 services, facilities, privileges, advantages, accommodations, or other opportunities to
7 an individual or entity because of the known disability of an individual with whom the
8 individual or entity is known to have a relationship or association.

9 25. The acts of Defendants set forth herein were a violation of Plaintiff's rights under the ADA,
10 and the regulations promulgated thereunder, 28 Code of Federal Regulations Part 36 et seq.

11 26. Among the general prohibits against discrimination were included in 42 USC
12 12182(b)(2)(A)(i) and (ii):

13 a. Discrimination. For purposes of subsection (a), discrimination includes:

14 i. the imposition or application of eligibility criteria that screen out or tend to
15 screen out an individual with a disability or any class of individuals with
16 disabilities from fully and equally enjoying any goods, services, facilities,
17 privileges, advantages, or accommodations, unless such criteria can be shown
18 to be necessary for the provision of the goods, services, facilities, privileges,
19 advantages, or accommodations being offered;

20 ii. a failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures,
21 when such modifications are necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities,
22 privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities,
23 unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would
24 fundamentally alter the nature of such goods, services, facilities, privileges,
25 advantages, or accommodations.

26 27. Plaintiff alleges that the facilities, policies, practices and procedure for entry to the Business
27 facility by persons with disabilities and their companions as established and set up by the
28 Defendants can be simply modified to eliminate disparate and discriminatory treatment of
28 persons with disabilities by properly constructing barrier-free handicapped access so as to

1 provide safe, full and equal enjoyment of the Business facilities as is enjoyed by other, non-
2 disabled, people.

3 28. The specific prohibition against retaliation and coercion is included in the Americans with
4 Disabilities Act of 1990 §503(b) and the Remedies and Procedures in §503(c):

- 5 a. Section 503(b) Interference, Coercion, or Intimidation. - It shall be unlawful to coerce,
6 intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, or
7 on account of his or her having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of his or her having
8 aided or encouraged any other individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, any right
9 granted or protected by this Act.
- 10 b. Section 503(c) Remedies and Procedure. - The remedies and procedures available
11 under sections 107, 203, and 308 of this Act shall be available to aggrieved persons for
12 violations of subsections (a) and (b), with respect to Title I, Title II and Title III,
13 respectively.

14 29. Among the specific prohibitions against discrimination were included, in 42 USC

15 §12182(b)(2)(a)(iv), "A failure to remove architectural barriers, and communications barriers
16 that are structural in nature, in existing facilities ... where such removal is 3dily achievable and
17 (v) "where and entity can demonstrate that the removal of a barrier under clause (iv) is not
18 readily achievable, a failure to make such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or
19 accommodations available through such methods are readily achievable." The acts of
20 Defendants set forth herein violated Plaintiffs rights under the "ADA," 42 USC 12181 et seq.,
21 and the regulations promulgated thereunder, 28 CFA Part 36, et seq.

22 30. The removal of the barriers complained of by Plaintiff as hereinabove alleged were at all times
23 after 1990 "readily achievable." On information and belief, if the removal of all the barriers
24 complained of here together were not removable, the removal of each individual barrier
25 complained of herein was "readily achievable."

26 31. Per 42 USC §12181(9), "The term 'readily-achievable' means easily accomplishable and able
27 to be carried out. The statute and attendant regulations define relative 'expense' in relation to
28 the total financial resources of the entities involved, including any 'parent' companies.

Plaintiff alleges that properly repairing each of the items that Plaintiff complains of herein is

1 readily achievable, including, but not limited to, correcting and repairing the items set forth in
2 the Paragraphs above. The changes needed to remove barriers to access for the disabled were
3 and are readily achievable by the defendants under standards set forth under 42 USC §12181 of
4 the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. (Further, if it were not "readily achievable" for
5 defendants to remove all such barriers, defendants have failed to make the required services
6 available through alternative methods, although such methods are achievable as required by 42
7 USC §12181(b)(2)(a)(iv),(v).)

8 **32.** Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, §308 (42 USC §12188 et seq.),
9 Plaintiff is entitled to the remedies and procedures set forth in the Civil Rights Act of 1964
10 §204(a), (42 USC §2000a-3(a)), as Plaintiff is being subjected to discrimination on the basis of
11 disability in violation of this title and/or Plaintiff has reasonable grounds for believing that he
12 is about to be subjected to discrimination in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of
13 1990, §302. Plaintiff cannot return to or make use of the subject Business' public facilities
14 complained of herein for the purpose of entry and provision of goods and service so long as
15 Defendants continue to apply eligibility criteria, policies, practices that screen out and refuse
16 to allow entry and service to persons with disabilities such as Plaintiff's.

17 **33.** Each of Defendants' acts and omissions of failing to provide barrier-free handicapped access
18 for Plaintiff, were tantamount to interference, intimidation, and coercion pursuant to the
19 Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 §503(b) (now 42 USC §12203): "It shall be unlawful
20 to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any individual in the exercise or enjoyment of,
21 or on account of his or her having aided or encouraged any other individual in the exercise or
22 enjoyment of, any right granted or protected by this Act."

23 **34.** Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 §308(a)(1) (now 42 USC §12188),
24 "Nothing in this section shall require a person with a disability to engage in a futile gesture if
25 such person has actual notice that a person or organization covered by this title does not intend
26 to comply with its provisions." Pursuant to this last section, Plaintiff, on information and
27 belief, alleges that defendants have continued to violate the law and deny the rights of Plaintiff
28 and other disabled persons to access this public accommodation for the purpose of shopping.

1 Therefore, Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief pursuant to §308(a)(2) "...Where appropriate,
2 injunctive relief shall also include requiring the provision of an auxiliary aid or service,
3 modifications of a policy, or provision of alternative methods, to the extent required by this
4 title."

5 35. Plaintiff seeks relief pursuant to remedies set forth in §204(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
6 (42 USC §2000a-3(a)), and pursuant to federal regulations adopted to implement the
7 Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, including, but not limited to, an order granting
8 injunctive relief and attorneys' fees. Such attorneys' fees, "including litigation expenses and
9 costs," are further specifically provided for by §505 of Title III.

10 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for damages as hereinafter stated.

11
12 II.SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: BREACH OF STATUTORY PROTECTIONS FOR
13 PERSONS WITH PHYSICAL DISABILITIES (California Health and Safety Code
14 §19955 et seq.)

15
16 36. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the
17 allegations contained in paragraphs 1 to 35 above and incorporates them herein as if separately
18 pled.

19 37. California Health & Safety Code §19955 provides in pertinent part: "The purpose of this part
20 is to insure that public accommodations or facilities constructed in this state with private funds
21 adhere to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Sec. 4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of
22 the Government Code. For the purposes of this part "public accommodation or facilities"
23 means a building, structure, facility, complex, or improved area which is used by the general
24 public, and shall include auditoriums, hospitals, theaters, hotels, motels, stadiums, and
25 convention centers. When sanitary facilities are made available for the public, clients or
26 employees in such accommodations or facilities, they shall be made available for the
27 handicapped.

1 38. California Health & Safety Code §19956, which appears in the same chapter as §19955,
2 provides in pertinent part, "accommodations constructed in this state shall conform to the
3 provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the
4 Government Code.. ." California Health and Safety Code §19956 was operative July 1, 1970,
5 and is applicable to all public accommodations constructed or altered after that date. On
6 information and belief, portions of the subject Business building and facilities were
7 constructed and/or altered after July 1, 1970, and substantial portions of said building and
8 facilities had alterations, structural repairs, and/or additions made to such public
9 accommodation after July 1, 1970, thereby requiring said public accommodations and/or
10 buildings to be subject to the requirements of Part 5.5, California Health Safety Code §19955,
11 et seq., upon such alteration, structural repairs or additions per California Health and Safety
12 Code §19955.

13 39. Pursuant to authority delegated by the California Government Code, the State Architect
14 promulgated regulations for the enforcement of these Code provisions. Effective January 1,
15 1988, Title 24 of the California Administrative Code adopted the California State Architect's
16 Regulations, and these regulations must be complied with as to any alterations and/or
17 modifications of the Business' facilities after that date. Construction changes occurring prior
18 to this date but after July 1, 1970, triggered access requirements pursuant to the "ASA"
19 requirements, the American Standards Association Specifications, A117.1 -1961. On
20 information and belief, at the time of the construction modification and of the Business'
21 building and facilities, all buildings and facilities covered were required to conform to each of
22 the standards and specifications described in the American Standards Association
23 Specifications and/or those contained in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code (now
24 known as Title 24, California Code of Regulations.)

25 40. Public facilities such as the subject Business are public accommodations or facilities within
26 the meaning of California Health and Safety Code §19955.

27 41. It is difficult or impossible for persons with physical disabilities who use walkers, wheelchairs,
28 canes, and service animals to travel about in public to use a facility with the defects set forth

1 above as required by Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and the Americans with
2 Disabilities Act Access Guidelines (ADAAG). Thus, when public accommodations fail to
3 provide handicap accessible public facilities, persons with disabilities are unable to enter and
4 use said facilities, and are denied full and equal access to and use of that facility that is
5 enjoyed by other members of the general public.

6 42. Plaintiff, and other similarly situated persons with physical disabilities whose physical
7 conditions require the use of walkers, wheelchairs, canes, and service animals, are unable to
8 use public facilities on a “full and equal” basis unless each such facility is in compliance with
9 the provisions of the California Health & Safety Code §19955, et seq. Plaintiff is a member of
10 that portion of the public whose rights are protected by the provisions of California Health &
11 Safety Code §19955, et seq.

12 43. The California Health and Safety Code was enacted to “ensure that public accommodations
13 and facilities constructed in this state with private funds adhere to the provisions of Chapter 7
14 (commencing with §4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the Government Code.” Such “public
15 accommodations” are defined to include facilities like this one.

16 44. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that as of the date of filing this complaint,
17 Defendants have not made accessible the facilities at the Business as set forth above.

18 45. Plaintiff, is informed and believes, and therefore alleges, that Defendants, and each of them,
19 caused the subject buildings and facilities constituting the Business to be constructed, altered
20 and maintained in such a manner that persons with physical disabilities were denied full and
21 equal access to, within and throughout said buildings and were denied full and equal use of
22 said public facilities, and despite knowledge and actual and constructive notice to such
23 Defendants that the configuration of this facility, and/or buildings was in violation of the civil
24 rights of persons with physical disabilities, such as Plaintiff. Such construction, modification,
25 ownership, operation, maintenance and practices of such public facilities are in violation of
26 law as stated in Part 5.5, California Health & Safety Code §19955, et seq., and elsewhere in
27 the laws of California.

1 46. On information and belief, the subject building constituting the public facilities of the Business
2 have denied full and equal access to Plaintiff and other persons with physical disabilities in
3 other respects due to non-compliance with requirements of Title 24 of the California Code of
4 Regulations and the California Health & Safety Code §19955, et seq.

5 47. The basis of Plaintiff's aforementioned information and belief is the various means upon which
6 Defendants must have acquired such knowledge, including, but not limited to, this lawsuit,
7 other access lawsuits, communications with operators of other similar facilities, and other
8 property owners regarding denial access, communications with Plaintiff and other persons
9 with disabilities, communications with other patrons who regularly visit there,
10 communications with owners of other businesses, notices and advisories they obtained from
11 governmental agencies through the mails, at seminars, posted bulletins, television, radio,
12 public service announcements, or upon modification, improvement, alteration or substantial
13 repair of the subject premises and other properties owned by these Defendants, newspaper
14 articles and trade publications regarding the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and
15 other access law, and other similar information. The scope and means of the knowledge of
16 each defendant is within each defendant's exclusive control and cannot be ascertained except
17 through discovery.

18 48. As a result of Defendants' acts and omissions in this regard, Plaintiff has been required to incur
19 legal expenses and hire attorneys in order to enforce his civil rights and enforce provisions of
20 the law protecting access for persons with physical disabilities and prohibiting discrimination
21 against persons with physical disabilities, and to take such action both in his own interests and
22 in order to enforce an important right affecting the public interest. Plaintiff, therefore, seeks
23 damages in this lawsuit for recovery of all reasonable attorneys' fees incurred, pursuant to the
24 provisions of the California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5. Plaintiff additionally seeks
25 attorneys' fees pursuant to California Health & Safety Code §I9953 and California Civil Code
26 §§54.3.

27 49. Defendants, and each of them, at times prior to and including the Visit Date, and continuing to
28 the present time, knew that persons with physical disabilities were denied their rights of equal

1 access to all portions of this public facility. Despite such knowledge, Defendants failed and
2 refused to take steps to comply with the applicable handicapped access statutes; and despite
3 knowledge of the resulting problems and denial of civil rights thereby suffered by Plaintiff and
4 other similarly situated persons with disabilities, including the specific notices referred to in
5 this Complaint. Defendants have failed and continue to fail to take action to grant full and
6 equal access to persons with physical disabilities in the respects complained of hereinabove.
7 Defendants and each of them have carried out a course of conduct of refusing to respond to, or
8 correct complaints about, denial of handicap access. Such actions and continuing course of
9 conduct by Defendants, evidence despicable conduct in conscious disregard for the rights or
10 safety of Plaintiff and of other similarly situated persons, justifying an award of statutory
11 damages pursuant to California Civil Code §54.3.

12 50. Defendants' actions have also been oppressive to persons with physical disabilities and to other
13 members of the public, and have evidenced actual or implied malicious intent towards those
14 members of the public, such as Plaintiff and other persons with physical disabilities who have
15 been denied the proper access they are entitled to by law. Further, Defendants' refusals on a
16 day-to-day basis to correct these problems evidences despicable conduct in conscious
17 disregard for the rights of Plaintiff and other members of the public with physical disabilities.

18 51. Plaintiff prays for an award of statutory damages against Defendants, and each of them,
19 pursuant to California Civil Code §54.3, in an amount sufficient to discourage owners,
20 operators, franchisers and franchisees of other public facilities from willful disregard of the
21 rights of persons with physical disabilities.

22 52. As a result of the actions and failure of Defendants, and each of them, and as a result of the
23 failure to provide proper accessible public facilities, Plaintiff was denied his civil rights,
24 including his right to full and equal access to public facilities, was embarrassed and
25 humiliated, suffered psychological and mental injuries and emotional distress, mental distress,
26 mental suffering, mental anguish, which includes shame, humiliation, embarrassment, anger,
27 chagrin, disappointment and worry, naturally associated with a person with a physical
28 disability being denied access to a public accommodation.

1 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for an injunction under this statute as hereinafter stated.
2
3

4 **III. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S CIVIL RIGHTS**
5 **ACTS (California Civil Code §§54, 54.1 and 54.3)**

6 53. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the
7 allegations contained in paragraphs 1 to 52 above and incorporates them herein as if separately
8 pled.

9 54. The public facilities above-described constitute public facilities and public accommodations
10 within the meaning of California Health and Safety Code §19955 et seq. and are facilities to
11 which members of the public are invited. The aforementioned acts and omissions of
12 defendants, and each of them, constitute a denial of equal access to and use and enjoyment of
13 these facilities by persons with disabilities, including Plaintiff. Said acts and omissions are
14 also in violation of the provisions of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.

15 55. The rights of Plaintiff, the entitlement of Plaintiff to full and equal access, and the denial by
16 defendants of such rights and entitlements are set forth in California Civil Code §§54, 54.1 and
17 54.3, to wit:

- 18 a. Individuals with disabilities shall have the same right as the ...general public to full and
19 free use of the streets, highways, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings, public
20 facilities, and other public places. (California Civil Code §54(a).)
- 21 b. Individuals with disabilities shall be entitled to full and equal access, as other members
22 of the general public, to accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of all
23 common carriers, airplanes, motor vehicles, railroad trains, motor buses, streetcars,
24 boats, or any other public conveyances or modes of transportation (whether private,
25 public, franchised, licensed, contracted, or otherwise provided), telephone facilities,
26 adoption agencies, private schools, hotels, lodging places, places of public
27 accommodation, amusement or resort, and other places to which the general public is

1 invited, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law, or state or
2 federal regulation, and applicable alike to all persons. (California Civil Code §54.1(a).)

3 56. On or about the Visit Date, Plaintiff suffered violations of California Civil Code §§54 and 54.1
4 in that he was denied full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities and privileges
5 of the Business as set forth in herein above. Plaintiff was also denied full and equal access to
6 other particulars, including, but not limited to, those described herein above. Plaintiff was also
7 denied use of facilities that he was entitled to under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities
8 Act of 1990.

9 57. As a result of the denial of full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities and
10 privileges of Defendants' Business due to the acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of
11 them, in owning, operating and maintaining this subject Business as a public facility, Plaintiff
12 has suffered a violation of his civil rights, including, but not limited to, rights under California
13 Civil Code §§54, 54.1, and 54.3, and has suffered and will suffer an injury-in-fact in the form
14 of emotional distress, mental distress, mental suffering, mental anguish, which includes shame,
15 humiliation, embarrassment, anger, chagrin, disappointment and worry, expectedly and
16 naturally associated with a disabled person's denial of full and equal enjoyment of goods,
17 services, and privileges, all to his damages as prayed hereinafter in an amount within the
18 jurisdiction of this court. Defendants' actions and omissions to act constituted discrimination
19 against Plaintiff on the sole basis that Plaintiff is disabled.

20 58. Plaintiff seeks damages for the violation of his rights as a disabled person that occurred on or
21 about the Visit Dates, according to proof, pursuant to California Civil Code §54.3, to wit
22 statutory damages, available pursuant to California Civil Code §54.3(a).

23 59. As a result of Defendants' acts and omissions in this regard, Plaintiff has been required to incur
24 legal expenses and hire attorneys in order to enforce his rights and enforce provisions of the
25 law protecting the full and equal enjoyment of goods, services, facilities, privileges of public
26 facilities by the disabled, and those individuals associated with or accompanied by a person
27 with disabilities, and prohibiting discrimination against the disabled. Plaintiff, therefore, seeks
28 recovery in this lawsuit for all reasonable attorneys' fees incurred pursuant to the provisions of

1 California Civil Code §52. Additionally, Plaintiff's lawsuit is intended not only to obtain
2 compensation for damages to Plaintiff, but also to compel the Defendants to make their goods,
3 services, facilities and privileges available and accessible to all members of the public with
4 physical disabilities, justifying public interest attorneys' fees pursuant to the provisions of
5 California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5.

60. The acts and omissions of Defendants in failing to provide the required accessible facilities
7 subsequent to the enactment date and compliance date of the Americans with Disabilities Act
8 of 1990 and refusal to make remedial alterations to their facilities and other elements as
9 hereinabove stated, after being notified by patrons before and after the time of Plaintiff's visit
10 and injuries, on or about the Visit Dates, and all times prior thereto, with the knowledge that
11 persons with disabilities would enter Defendants' premises, the reason given therefor, was an
12 established policy, practice, and procedure of refusing and denying entry and/or use of
13 facilities, thereby denying services to a person with disabilities and the companions thereor,
14 evidence malice and oppression toward Plaintiff and other disabled persons.

61. Defendants have failed to establish a non-discriminatory criteria, policy, practice and
procedure for entry into said Business as hereinabove described.

62. As a result of defendants' continuing failure to provide for the full and equal enjoyment of
goods, services, facilities and privileges of said Business as hereinabove described, Plaintiff
has continually been denied his full and equal enjoyment of the subject facilities at the
Business, as it would be a "futile gesture to attempt to patronize" said Business with the
discriminatory policy in place as hereinabove described.

63. The acts and omissions of Defendants as complained of herein in failing to provide the
required accessible facilities subsequent to the enactment date and compliance date of the
Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and refusal to make remedial modifications and
alterations to the architectural barriers as stated herein and in failing to establish practices,
policies and procedures to allow safe access by persons who are disabled are continuing on a
day-to-day basis to have the effect of wrongfully and willfully excluding Plaintiff and other
members of the public who are disabled from full and equal enjoyment of the subject Business

1 as hereinabove described. Such acts and omissions are the continuing cause of humiliation and
2 mental and emotional suffering of Plaintiff in that these actions continue to treat Plaintiff as an
3 inferior and second class citizen and serve to discriminate against him on the sole basis that he
4 is disabled. Plaintiff is unable so long as such acts and omissions of defendants continue, to
5 achieve full and equal enjoyment of the goods and services of said Business as described
6 hereinabove. The acts of Defendants have legally caused and will continue to cause irreparable
7 injury to Plaintiff if not enjoined by this court.

8 64. Wherefore, Plaintiff asks this court to preliminarily and permanently any continuing refusal by
9 Defendants to permit entry to said Business and to serve Plaintiff or others similarly situated,
10 and to require Defendants to comply forthwith with the applicable statutory requirements
11 relating to the full and equal enjoyment of goods and services as described hereinabove for
12 disabled persons pursuant to the ADA. Plaintiff further requests that the court award statutory
13 costs and attorneys' fees to Plaintiff pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5, all
14 as hereinafter prayed for.

15
16 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for statutory damages, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as
17 allowed by statute and according to proof.

18
19 IV. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA UNRUH CIVIL
20 RIGHTS ACT (California Civil Code §51 and §51.5.)

21
22 65. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the
23 allegations contained in paragraphs 1 to 64 above and incorporates them herein as if separately
24 pled.

25 66. Defendant' acts and omissions as specified with regard to the discriminatory treatment of
26 Plaintiff, on the basis of his disabilities, have been in violation of California Civil Code §§51
27 and 51.5, the Unruh Civil Rights Act, and have denied to Plaintiff his rights to "full and equal
28

1 accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges or services in all business establishments of
2 every kind whatsoever.”

3 67. California Civil Code §51 also provides that “[a] violation of the right of any individual under
4 the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336) shall also constitute a
5 violation of this section.”

6 68. California Civil Code §51.5 also provides that “[no business establishment of any kind
7 whatsoever shall discriminate against, boycott, or blacklist, refuse to buy from, sell to, or trade
8 with any person in this state because of the race, creed, religion, color, national origin, sex,
9 disability of the person or of the person's partners, members, stockholders, directors, officers,
10 managers, superintendents, agents, employees, business associates, suppliers, or customers.”

11 69. As a result of the violation of Plaintiffs civil rights protected by California Civil Code §§51
12 and 51.5, Plaintiff is entitled to the rights and remedies of California Civil Code §52, including
13 statutory damages, as well as reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as allowed by statute,
14 according to proof. California Civil Code §55 is specifically not invoked by plaintiff.

15 70. Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §425.50: (a) this complaint is filed on behalf of
16 a high-frequency litigant, as defined; (b) 21; (c) shopping and dining in the Oakland area; (d)
17 to buy food and drink from this business.

18 71. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and provide relief as follows:

19
20 PRAYER FOR RELIEF

21 Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and provide relief as follows:

22
23 1. Grant injunctive relief requiring that Defendants establish a nondiscriminatory
24 criteria, policy, practice and procedure permitting entry into the subject Business in
25 the City of Oakland, California, for the purpose of obtaining the goods and services accorded
26 therein according to California Civil Code §§51, 51.5, 52, 54, 54.1, and 54.3, et seq., and Title III of
27 the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and grant injunctive relief requiring that Defendants
28 repair and render safe to disabled persons, and otherwise make accessible, all public areas of the

Business' business area, including, but not limited to, each of the barriers to access identified above, and make such facilities "readily accessible to and usable" by individuals with disabilities according to the standards of Title 24 of the California Administrative Code, California Health & Safety Code §19955 et seq., and Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the standards of ADAAG; and prohibiting operation of the Business located in the City of Oakland, California, as a public facility until Defendants provide full and equal enjoyment of goods and services as described hereinabove to disabled persons, including Plaintiff.

2. Statutory damages, according to proof, pursuant to California Civil Code §52 (minimum statutory damages of \$4,000 per visit x 4 visits (3 actual, 1 deterred) for a total minimum statutory damages of \$16,000, a grand total of \$20,000), and California Civil Code §54.3.
3. Prejudgment interest on all statutory damages;
4. Remedies and Procedures available under Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, §§I 07,203 and 308;
5. An Injunction under the ADA, and under California Civil Code §52 and §54, and California Health and Safety Code §19953 et seq. to remove the barriers to disabled access;
6. Award Plaintiff all litigation expenses, all costs of this proceeding and a reasonable attorneys' fees as provided by law, including, but not limited to, those recoverable pursuant to the provisions of California Civil Code §§52, and 54.3, California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5, and Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §12205); and
7. Grant such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

/s/ Richard A. Mac Bride

Richard A. Mac Bride, Attorney for Plaintiff

Date: March 24, 2022

REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby requests a jury for all claims for which a jury is permitted.

/s/ Richard A. Mac Bride

Richard A. Mac Bride, Attorney for Plaintiff

Date: March 24, 2022

VERIFICATION

I, Richard Sepulveda, plaintiff herein, hereby swear under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California as follows: I am familiar with the contents of this complaint and verify that the facts alleged are true and correct according to my personal knowledge, except as to those matters that are pled on information and belief, and as to those matters, I have reason to believe that they are true.

/s/ Richard Sepulveda

Richard Sepulveda

Date: March 24, 2022